

On positive solutions for (p, q) -Laplace equations with two parameters *

Vladimir Bobkov^{†‡}

Institute of Mathematics, Ufa Science Center of RAS
Chernyshevsky str. 112, Ufa 450008, Russia
e-mail: bobkovve@gmail.com

Mieko Tanaka

Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
Kagurazaka 1-3, Shinjyuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan
e-mail: tanaka@ma.kagu.tus.ac.jp

Abstract

We study the existence and non-existence of positive solutions for the (p, q) -Laplace equation $-\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u = \alpha|u|^{p-2}u + \beta|u|^{q-2}u$, where $p \neq q$, under the zero Dirichlet boundary condition in Ω . The main result of our research is the construction of a continuous curve in (α, β) plane, which becomes a threshold between the existence and non-existence of positive solutions. Furthermore, we provide the example of domains Ω for which the corresponding first Dirichlet eigenvalue of $-\Delta_p$ is not monotone w.r.t. $p > 1$.

keywords: (p, q) -Laplacian, nonlinear eigenvalue problems, global minimizer, mountain pass theorem, Nehari manifold, super- and sub-solution, modified Picone's identity, extended functional

1. Introduction

In this article we are concerned with the existence and non-existence of positive solutions for the following (p, q) -Laplace equation:

$$(GEV; \alpha, \beta) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u = \alpha|u|^{p-2}u + \beta|u|^{q-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 1$) is a bounded domain with C^2 -boundary $\partial\Omega$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 < q < p < \infty$. Note that the assumption $q < p$ is taken without loss of generality, due to the symmetry of symbols in $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$; therefore all results of the present work have corresponding counterparts in the case $q > p$.

*AMS Subject Classifications: 35J62, 35J20, 35P30

[†]Corresponding author

[‡]The first author was partially supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (projects No. 13-01-00294 and 14-01-31054)

Operator Δ_r stands for the usual r -Laplacian, i.e., $\Delta_r u := \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{r-2} \nabla u)$ with $r \in (1, +\infty)$. Hereinafter, by $W_0^{1,r} := W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ we denote the standard Sobolev space, and $\|\cdot\|_r$ denotes the norm in $L^r(\Omega)$.

We say that $u \in W_0^{1,p}$ is a (weak) solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ if it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} (\alpha |u|^{p-2} u + \beta |u|^{q-2} u) \varphi \, dx$$

for all $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}$.

In the last few years, the (p, q) -Laplace operator attracts a lot of attention and has been studied by many authors (cf. [7, 10, 23, 26]). However, there are only few results regarding the eigenvalue problems for the (p, q) -Laplacian. The study of the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ started in the form of a perturbation of *homogeneous* eigenvalue problem (see [4, 5, 19, 24]). Recently, Motreanu and the second author in [21] introduced the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u = \lambda(m_p(x)|u|^{p-2}u + m_q(x)|u|^{q-2}u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where indefinite weights $m_p, m_q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ are such that the Lebesgue measure of $\{x \in \Omega : m_r(x) > 0\}$ is positive ($r = p, q$).

In [14], by using the time map, Kajikiya et al. provided five typical examples of the bifurcation of positive solutions for the one-dimensional (p, q) -Laplace equation on the interval $(-L, L)$:

$$\begin{cases} (|u'|^{p-2}u')' + (|u'|^{q-2}u')' + \lambda(|u|^{p-2}u + |u|^{q-2}u) = 0, \\ u(-L) = u(L) = 0. \end{cases}$$

They have shown that the bifurcation curve changes depending on p, q and L .

Investigation of the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ with *two* spectral parameters, on the one hand, generalizes and complements the research [21], and seems more natural, due to the structure of the equation. We restrict ourselves to the case where m_p and m_q are constants, to save transparency and simplicity of presentation. However, we emphasize that all the results of the present article remain valid for the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ with *non-negative* weights:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u = \alpha m_p(x)|u|^{p-2}u + \beta m_q(x)|u|^{q-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $m_r \in L^\infty(x)$, $m_r \not\equiv 0$ and $m_r \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω for $r = p, q$.


On the other hand, the statement of the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has been inspired by the conception of the Fučík spectrum, which, in terms of the p -Laplacian, consists of finding all spectral points (α, β) such that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \alpha u_+^{p-1} - \beta u_-^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$


possesses non-trivial solutions (cf. [8]). The set of all such points (α, β) is called the Fučík spectrum for the p -Laplacian. Here we denote $u_\pm := \max\{\pm u, 0\}$ in Ω . From a physical point of view, the values α and β can be seen as a

contribution of u_+ and u_- to the steady-state behavior of the corresponding nonlinear reaction-diffusion equation.

In the present article we provide a *complete* description of 2-dimensional sets in the (α, β) plane, which correspond to the existence and non-existence of positive solutions for $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$, see Fig. 1 and Section 2 for precise statements. Moreover, we also give a description of the principal 1-dimensional sets. The main result here is the construction of a continuous threshold curve $\mathcal{C}$, which separates the regions of the existence and non-existence of positive solutions for $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$.



a) **(LI)** holds



b) **(LI)** is violated

Figure 1: Shaded sets correspond to existence, unshaded to non-existence

As usual, we say that λ is an eigenvalue of $-\Delta_r$ with weight function $m_r \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ if the problem

$$(EV; r, \lambda) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_r u = \lambda m_r(x) |u|^{r-2} u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

has a non-trivial solution. If the Lebesgue measure of $\{x \in \Omega : m_r(x) > 0\}$ is positive, then $(EV; r, \lambda)$ possesses the first positive eigenvalue $\lambda_1(r, m_r)$ (cf. [2]), that can be obtained by minimizing the Rayleigh quotient:

$$\lambda_1(r, m_r) := \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^r dx}{\int_{\Omega} m_r |u|^r dx} : u \in W_0^{1,r}, \int_{\Omega} m_r |u|^r dx > 0 \right\}.$$

We note that $\lambda_1(r, m_r)$ is simple and isolated, and the corresponding eigenfunction $\varphi_1(r, m_r)$ belongs to $C_0^{1,\alpha_r}(\overline{\Omega})$, where $\alpha_r \in (0, 1)$. Hereinafter we will also use the notation $\lambda_1(r)$ for the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta_r$ without weight (that is, with $m_r \equiv 1$) and φ_r for the corresponding eigenfunction.

In what follows, we will say that $\lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda_1(q)$ have different eigenspaces if the corresponding eigenfunctions φ_p and φ_q are linearly independent, i.e. the following assumption is satisfied:

(LI) For any $k \neq 0$ it holds $\varphi_p \not\equiv k\varphi_q$ in Ω .

Let us note that availability or violation of the assumption **(LI)** significantly affects the sets of existence of solutions for $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$, see Fig. 1 and the next section for precise statements.

Although it is not shown, to the best of our knowledge, that **(LI)** generally holds, in the one-dimensional case $\lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda_1(q)$ have different eigenspaces for $p \neq q$ (cf. [14]). Therefore, we conjecture that **(LI)** is always satisfied for the eigenvalue problems *without* weights in the general n -dimensional case.

At the same time, **(LI)** can be violated, if we consider eigenvalues $\lambda_1(p, m_p)$ and $\lambda_1(q, m_q)$ *with* (non-negative) weights. The corresponding example is given in Appendix C. Hence, the breach of the assumption **(LI)** may actually occur for the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ with non-negative weights, for which, as noted above, all the results of the article hold.

Considering $\lambda_1(r)$ (or $\lambda_1(r, m_r)$) as a function of r there also arise questions about the behaviour of this function and its geometrical properties.

It is known from Kajikiya et al. [14] that in a one-dimensional case, i.e. $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$, the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(r)$ is non-monotone w.r.t. $r > 1$ provided $\Omega = (-L, L)$ with $L > 1$, that is, there exists a unique maximum point $r^*(L) > 1$ of $\lambda_1(r)$ such that $\lambda_1(r)$ is strictly increasing on $(1, r^*(L))$ and strictly decreasing on $(r^*(L), \infty)$.

In Appendix B we show that the same non-monotonicity of $\lambda_1(r)$ w.r.t. $r > 1$ occurs also in a higher dimensional case.

Now we give three results from [21], where they were proved using the variational methods. These results will be used below.

Theorem 1.1 ([21, Theorem 1]) *If it holds*

$$-\min\{\lambda_1(p, -m_p), \lambda_1(q, -m_q)\} < \lambda < \min\{\lambda_1(p, m_p), \lambda_1(q, m_q)\},$$

then (1.1) has no non-trivial solutions.

Theorem 1.2 ([21, Theorem 3]) *Assume that there holds $\lambda_1(p, m_p) \neq \lambda_1(q, m_q)$ (resp. $\lambda_1(p, -m_p) \neq \lambda_1(q, -m_q)$). If*

$$\begin{aligned} & \min\{\lambda_1(p, m_p), \lambda_1(q, m_q)\} < \lambda < \max\{\lambda_1(p, m_p), \lambda_1(q, m_q)\} \\ \text{(resp. } & -\max\{\lambda_1(p, -m_p), \lambda_1(q, -m_q)\} < \lambda < -\min\{\lambda_1(p, -m_p), \lambda_1(q, -m_q)\}), \end{aligned}$$

then (1.1) has at least one positive solution.

Theorem 1.3 ([21, Theorems 4, 5]) Assume that for $(r, r') = (p, q)$ or (q, p) ,

$$\pm \lambda = \lambda_1(r, \pm m_r) > \lambda_1(r', \pm m_{r'}) \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_1(r, \pm m_r)|^{r'} dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} m_{r'} \varphi_1(r, \pm m_r)^{r'} dx > 0, \quad (1.3)$$

respectively. Then (1.1) has at least one positive solution.

Notice that we set $\lambda_1(r, -m_r) = +\infty$, provided $m_r \geq 0$ in Ω .

Let us mention that in [21], there is no information about the case when λ is beyond the first eigenvalues $\lambda_1(p, m_p)$ and $\lambda_1(q, m_q)$, i.e. $\lambda > \max\{\lambda_1(p, m_p), \lambda_1(q, m_q)\}$. In the next section we provide corresponding results on existence and non-existence in this case.

2. Main results

First, we state our results for the case $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [\lambda_1(p), +\infty) \times [\lambda_1(q), +\infty)$ (see Fig. 1). These results generalize Theorems 1 and 2 from [21] for the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ with non-negative weights.

Proposition 2.1 *If it holds*

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in (-\infty, \lambda_1(p)] \times (-\infty, \lambda_1(q)] \setminus \{(\lambda_1(p), \lambda_1(q))\},$$

then $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has no non-trivial solutions.

Moreover, $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ with $\alpha = \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta = \lambda_1(q)$ has a non-trivial (positive) solution if and only if they have the same eigenspace, namely, there exists $k \neq 0$ such that $\varphi_p \equiv k\varphi_q$ in Ω (that is, **(LI)** is not satisfied).

Proposition 2.2 *If it holds*

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in (\lambda_1(p), +\infty) \times (-\infty, \lambda_1(q)) \cup (-\infty, \lambda_1(p)) \times (\lambda_1(q), +\infty),$$

then $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has at least one positive solution.

The main novelty of the work is the treatment of the rest part of (α, β) plane, i.e. $(\alpha, \beta) \in [\lambda_1(p), +\infty) \times [\lambda_1(q), +\infty)$, where we construct a threshold curve, which separates the regions of existence and non-existence of positive solutions for $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$.

Note first that for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ is equivalent to $(GEV; \beta + s, \beta)$, where $s = \alpha - \beta$. Denoting now, for convenience, $\lambda = \beta$, for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we consider

$$\lambda^*(s) := \sup\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : (GEV; \lambda + s, \lambda) \text{ has a positive solution}\}, \quad (2.1)$$

provided $(GEV; \lambda + s, \lambda)$ has a positive solution for some λ . If there are no such λ , we set $\lambda^*(s) = -\infty$. Define also

$$s^* := \lambda_1(p) - \lambda_1(q) \quad \text{and} \quad s_+^* := \frac{\|\nabla \varphi_q\|_p^p}{\|\varphi_q\|_p^p} - \lambda_1(q).$$

Theorem 2.4 Assume that **(LI)** does not hold. Then $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has at least one positive solution if and only if

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in (\lambda_1(p), +\infty) \times (-\infty, \lambda_1(q)) \cup (-\infty, \lambda_1(p)) \times (\lambda_1(q), +\infty) \cup \{(\lambda_1(p), \lambda_1(q))\}. \quad (2.2)$$

The second main result is related to the case when $\lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda_1(q)$ have different eigenspaces, and justifies that $\mathcal{C}$ is indeed a *threshold curve* which separates the regions of existence and non-existence of positive solutions for $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$.

Theorem 2.5 Assume that **(LI)** is satisfied. If one of the following cases holds (see Fig. 2), then $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has at least one positive solution:

- (i) $\lambda_1(q) < \beta$ and $\beta < \lambda^*(\alpha - \beta)$;
- (ii) $\lambda_1(p) < \alpha$ and $\beta < \lambda^*(\alpha - \beta)$.

Conversely, if $\beta > \lambda^*(\alpha - \beta)$, then $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has no positive solutions.

This theorem means that $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ possesses a positive solution if (α, β) is below the curve $\mathcal{C}$, and has no positive solutions if (α, β) is above $\mathcal{C}$.

We emphasize that Theorem 2.5 in combination with Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 provides a full description of 2-dimensional sets of existence and non-existence for positive solutions to $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ when **(LI)** holds.

Finally, we provide the results about existence and non-existence on the curve $\mathcal{C}$.

Proposition 2.6 The following assertions hold:

- (i) If $\lambda^*(s) + s > \lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda^*(s) > \lambda_1(q)$, then $(GEV; \lambda^*(s) + s, \lambda^*(s))$ has at least one positive solution;
- (ii) If $s > s_+^*$, then $(GEV; \lambda^*(s) + s, \lambda^*(s)) \equiv (GEV; \lambda_1(q) + s, \lambda_1(q))$ has no positive solutions.

We remark that the existence of positive solutions remains open in the borderline case $(GEV; \lambda_1(p), \lambda^*(s))$ if the curve $\mathcal{C}$ touches the line $\{\lambda_1(p)\} \times (\lambda_1(q), +\infty)$.

Let us note that the main disadvantage of characterization (2.1) of $\lambda^*(s)$ is its non-constructive form. However, using the extended functional method (see [13, 6]) we provide the equivalent characterization of $\lambda^*(s)$ by an explicit minimax formula, which can be used in further numerical investigations of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$:

$$\Lambda^*(s) = \sup_{u \in \text{int } C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+} \inf_{\varphi \in C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{L}_s(u; \varphi), \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_s(u; \varphi) = \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \, dx - s \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p-2} u \varphi \, dx}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^{p-2} u \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |u|^{q-2} u \varphi \, dx}$$

and $\text{int } C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+$ denotes the interior of the positive cone

$$C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ = \{u \in C_0^1(\bar{\Omega}) : u(x) \geq 0 \text{ for every } x \in \Omega\}$$

of the Banach space $C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$, that is,

$$\text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ = \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in \Omega, \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x) < 0 \text{ for all } x \in \partial\Omega \right\}, \quad (2.4)$$

with an outer normal ν to $\partial\Omega$.

Proposition 2.7 $\Lambda^*(s) = \lambda^*(s)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Notice that we don't provide information about uniqueness, multiplicity, or existence and non-existence of sign-changing (nodal) solutions for $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. To the best of our knowledge, there are only partial results in these directions (see [24, Theorem 3], [25]).

The article is organized as follows. In Section 3, we prove Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. In Section 4, we prove the existence of solution for $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ in the neighbourhood of $(\lambda_1(p), \lambda_1(q))$ provided **(LI)** is satisfied, which becomes the main ingredient in the proof of Proposition 2.3, Part (iv). In Section 5, we introduce the method of super- and sub-solutions, which is the necessary tool for the proofs in next sections. Section 6 is devoted to the proof of Proposition 2.3. In Section 7, we prove the main existence results: Theorems 2.4, 2.5 and Proposition 2.6. In Section 8, we prove Proposition 2.7. In Appendix A, we present a version of the Picone identity for (p, q) -Laplacian. Appendix B is devoted to the proof of non-monotonic property of the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(p)$ w.r.t. $p > 1$. In Appendix C, we provide an example of the violation of the assumption **(LI)**.

3. Proofs of Propositions 2.1 and 2.2

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let $\alpha \leq \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta \leq \lambda_1(q)$. Assume that $u \in W_0^{1,p}$ is a non-trivial solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. Taking u as a test function and using the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (\lambda_1(p) - \alpha) \|u\|_p^p \leq \|\nabla u\|_p^p - \alpha \|u\|_p^p \\ &= \beta \|u\|_q^q - \|\nabla u\|_q^q \leq (\beta - \lambda_1(q)) \|u\|_q^q \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This chain of inequalities is satisfied if and only if $\alpha = \lambda_1(p)$, $\beta = \lambda_1(q)$ and u is the eigenfunction corresponding to $\lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda_1(q)$ simultaneously. As a result, our conclusion is shown. $\blacksquare$

To prove Proposition 2.2 we introduce functional $I_{\alpha, \beta}$ on $W_0^{1,p}$ by

$$I_{\alpha, \beta}(u) := \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_p^p + \frac{1}{q} \|\nabla u\|_q^q - \frac{\alpha}{p} \|u_+\|_p^p - \frac{\beta}{q} \|u_+\|_q^q. \quad (3.1)$$

Remark 3.1 It can be shown that non-trivial critical points of $I_{\alpha, \beta}$ correspond to non-negative solutions of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ by taking u_- as a test function. Moreover, any non-negative solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ belongs to $\text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ (see definition (2.4)). In fact, if u is a solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$, then $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ by the Moser iteration process (see Appendix A in [20]). Hence, the regularity up to

the boundary in [16, Theorem 1] and [17, p. 320] ensures that $u \in C_0^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ with some $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, the strong maximum principle [22, Theorem 5.4.1] guarantees that $u > 0$ in Ω , since $u \not\equiv 0$ and $u \geq 0$. Therefore, u is a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ and [22, Theorem 5.5.1] implies that $\partial u / \partial \nu < 0$ on $\partial \Omega$. As a result, $u \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$.

Proof of Proposition 2.2. **Case (i):** $\alpha > \lambda_1(p)$ and $0 < \beta < \lambda_1(q)$. In this case, we note that

$$\lambda_1\left(p, \frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right) = \frac{\lambda_1(p)\beta}{\alpha} < \beta < \lambda_1(q) = \lambda_1(q, 1)$$

and

$$\alpha|u|^{p-2}u + \beta|u|^{q-2}u = \beta\left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}|u|^{p-2}u + |u|^{q-2}u\right).$$

Thus, our conclusion follows from application of Theorem 1.2 to the problem (1.1) with $\lambda = \beta$, $m_p = \alpha/\beta$ and $m_q = 1$.

Case (ii): $0 < \alpha < \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta > \lambda_1(q)$. We proceed as above, applying Theorem 1.2 to (1.1) with $\lambda = \alpha$, $m_p = 1$ and $m_q = \beta/\alpha$.

Case (iii): $\alpha > \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta \leq 0$. By the same argument as in [24, Lemma 8], it can be shown that $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfies the Palais–Smale condition. Moreover, it is proved in [24, Theorem 2] that for functional J on $W_0^{1,p}$ defined by

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{p}\|\nabla u\|_p^p + \frac{1}{q}\|\nabla u\|_q^q - \frac{\alpha}{p}\|u_+\|_p^p,$$

there exist $\delta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ such that

$$J(u) \geq \delta \quad \text{provided } \|u\|_q = \rho.$$

Since $\beta \leq 0$, this implies that $I_{\alpha,\beta}(u) \geq J(u) \geq \delta$ provided $\|u\|_q = \rho$. For the positive eigenfunction φ_p corresponding to $\lambda_1(p)$ and sufficiently large $t > 0$, we have

$$I_{\alpha,\beta}(t\varphi_p) = \frac{t^p}{p}(\lambda_1(p) - \alpha)\|\varphi_p\|_p^p + \frac{t^q}{q}(\|\nabla \varphi_p\|_q^q - \beta\|\varphi_p\|_q^q) < 0,$$

since $\lambda_1(p) - \alpha < 0$ and $p > q$. Consequently, by applying the mountain pass theorem, $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ has a positive critical value (see [24, Theorem 2] or [21, Theorem 3] for the details).

Case (iv): $\alpha \leq 0$ and $\beta > \lambda_1(q)$. In this case, it can be easily shown that $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ is coercive and bounded from below, due to $q < p$ and the inequality

$$I_{\alpha,\beta}(u) \geq \frac{1}{p}\|\nabla u\|_p^p - \frac{\beta}{q}\|u_+\|_q^q \geq \frac{1}{p}\|\nabla u\|_p^p - C\|\nabla u_+\|_p^q,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $u \in W_0^{1,p}$. Moreover, $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ is weakly lower semi-continuous by the compactness of the embedding of $W_0^{1,p}$ to $L^p(\Omega)$ and $L^q(\Omega)$, and therefore $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ has a global minimizer $u \in W_0^{1,p}$ (cf. [18, Theorem 1.1]). On the other hand, for the positive eigenfunction φ_q corresponding to $\lambda_1(q)$ and sufficiently small $t > 0$, we have

$$I_{\alpha,\beta}(t\varphi_q) = \frac{t^q}{q}(\lambda_1(q) - \beta)\|\varphi_q\|_q^q + \frac{t^p}{p}(\|\nabla \varphi_q\|_p^p - \alpha\|\varphi_q\|_p^p) < 0,$$

whence $I(u) = \min_{W_0^{1,p}} I_{\alpha,\beta} < 0$, and therefore u is a non-trivial solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. ■

4. Existence of solution for $\alpha = \lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon$, $\beta = \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon$ under the assumption (LI)

We define the energy functional corresponding to $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ by

$$E_{\alpha, \beta}(u) = \frac{1}{p}H_{\alpha}(u) + \frac{1}{q}G_{\beta}(u),$$

where for further simplicity we denote

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\alpha}(u) &:= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx - \alpha \int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx, \\ G_{\beta}(u) &:= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q dx - \beta \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $E_{\alpha, \beta} \in C^1(W_0^{1,p}, \mathbb{R})$. We introduce the so-called *Nehari manifold*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha, \beta} := \left\{ u \in W_0^{1,p} \setminus \{0\} : \langle E'_{\alpha, \beta}(u), u \rangle = H_{\alpha}(u) + G_{\beta}(u) = 0 \right\}.$$

Proposition 4.1 *Let $u \in W_0^{1,p}$. If $H_{\alpha}(u) \cdot G_{\beta}(u) < 0$, then there exists a unique extremum point $t(u) > 0$ of $E_{\alpha, \beta}(tu)$ w.r.t. $t > 0$, and $t(u)u \in \mathcal{N}_{\alpha, \beta}$. In particular, if*

$$G_{\beta}(u) < 0 < H_{\alpha}(u), \quad (4.1)$$

then $t(u)$ is the unique minimum point of $E_{\alpha, \beta}(tu)$ w.r.t. $t > 0$, and $E_{\alpha, \beta}(t(u)u) < 0$.

Proof. Fix some non-trivial function $u \in W_0^{1,p}$ and consider the fibered functional corresponding to $E_{\alpha, \beta}(u)$:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\alpha, \beta}(tu) &= \frac{1}{p}H_{\alpha}(tu) + \frac{1}{q}G_{\beta}(tu) \\ &= \frac{t^p}{p}H_{\alpha}(u) + \frac{t^q}{q}G_{\beta}(u), \quad t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption $H_{\alpha}(u) \cdot G_{\beta}(u) < 0$ the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}E_{\alpha, \beta}(tu) = t^{p-1}H_{\alpha}(u) + t^{q-1}G_{\beta}(u) = 0, \quad t > 0,$$

is satisfied for unique $t > 0$ given by

$$t = t(u) = \left(\frac{-G_{\beta}(u)}{H_{\alpha}(u)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-q}} > 0.$$

This implies that

$$\langle E'_{\alpha, \beta}(t(u)u), t(u)u \rangle = t(u) \cdot \frac{d}{dt}E_{\alpha, \beta}(tu) \Big|_{t=t(u)} = 0,$$

and hence $t(u)u \in \mathcal{N}_{\alpha, \beta}$. Moreover, recalling that $q < p$, if (4.1) holds, then

$$E_{\alpha, \beta}(t(u)u) = \frac{1}{p}H_{\alpha}(t(u)u) + \frac{1}{q}G_{\beta}(t(u)u) = \frac{p-q}{pq}G_{\beta}(t(u)u) < 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} E_{\alpha,\beta}(tu) \right|_{t=t(u)} &= (p-1)t(u)^{p-2}H_\alpha(u) + (q-1)t(u)^{q-2}G_\beta(u) \\ &= \frac{1}{t(u)^2} ((p-1)H_\alpha(t(u)u) + (q-1)G_\beta(t(u)u)) = \frac{q-p}{t(u)^2} G_\beta(t(u)u) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $t(u)$ is a minimum point of $E_{\alpha,\beta}(tu)$ w.r.t. $t > 0$. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 4.2 *Assume that (LI) is satisfied. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Moreover, there exists $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$, such that $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u) < 0$.*

Proof. Since (LI) is satisfied and due to the simplicity of $\lambda_1(p)$, we have $H_{\lambda_1(p)}(\varphi_q) \neq 0$, which yields $H_{\lambda_1(p)}(\varphi_q) > 0$. At the same time, $G_{\lambda_1(q)}(\varphi_q) = 0$ by the definition of $\lambda_1(q)$. Hence, there exists sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ it still holds $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon}(\varphi_q) > 0$. Moreover $G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(\varphi_q) < 0$. Applying now Proposition 4.1 we get the desired results. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 4.3 *Assume that $H_\alpha(u) \neq 0$ or $G_\beta(u) \neq 0$. If $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a critical point of $E_{\alpha,\beta}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\beta}$, then u is a critical point of $E_{\alpha,\beta}$ on $W_0^{1,p}$.*

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\beta}$ be a critical point of $E_{\alpha,\beta}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\beta}$. Since we are assuming that $H_\alpha(u) \neq 0$ or $G_\beta(u) \neq 0$, u satisfies

$$\langle (H_\alpha(u) + G_\beta(u))', u \rangle = pH_\alpha(u) + qG_\beta(u) = (p-q)H_\alpha(u) = (q-p)G_\beta(u) \neq 0,$$

where we used the fact that $H_\alpha(u) + G_\beta(u) = 0$ for $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\beta}$. This implies that $(H_\alpha(u) + G_\beta(u))' \neq 0$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^*$. Due to the Lagrange multiplier rule (see, e.g. [27, Theorem 48.B and Corollary 48.10]), there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\langle E'_{\alpha,\beta}(u), \xi \rangle = \mu \langle (H_\alpha(u) + G_\beta(u))', \xi \rangle$$

for each $\xi \in W_0^{1,p}$. Taking $\xi = u$ we get

$$0 = \langle E'_{\alpha,\beta}(u), u \rangle = \mu(pH_\alpha(u) + qG_\beta(u)) = \mu(p-q)H_\alpha(u) = \mu(q-p)G_\beta(u),$$

since $H_\alpha(u) + G_\beta(u) = 0$. Therefore $\mu = 0$ and

$$\langle E'_{\alpha,\beta}(u), \xi \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in W_0^{1,p},$$

i.e. u is a critical point of $E_{\alpha,\beta}$ on $W_0^{1,p}$. $\blacksquare$

If $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ is a minimizer of $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ on the Nehari manifold $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ and it satisfies $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon}(u) \neq 0$ (or equivalently $G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u) \neq 0$), then u is a critical point of $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ by Lemma 4.3, i.e. u is a solution of $(GEV; \lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon, \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon)$.

Since Lemma 4.2 implies the existence of $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, we can find a corresponding minimization sequence $\{u_k^\varepsilon\}_{k=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$, namely,

$$E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \inf \{E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u) : u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}\} =: M_\varepsilon$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The following result states that this minimization sequence is bounded for any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, and so $M_\varepsilon > -\infty$ holds, since $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ is bounded on bounded sets.

Lemma 4.4 *Assume that (LI) is satisfied. Then there exist $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that $\|\nabla u_k^\varepsilon\|_p \leq C$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$.*

Proof. Notice that for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ Lemma 4.2 implies $M_\varepsilon < 0$. Hence, considering sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we may assume that $G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon) < 0$ by noting that for $u_k^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ it holds

$$\frac{p-q}{pq} G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon) = E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon) \quad (4.2)$$

with $q < p$. Consequently, we also get that $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon) > 0$ for such $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.

Suppose the assertion of the lemma is false. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $\varepsilon(m) \in (0, 1/m)$ and $k(m) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $u_m := u_{k(m)}^{\varepsilon(m)} \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m), \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon(m)}$ it holds $\|\nabla u_m\|_p > m$. Consider the normalized sequence $\{v_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$, such that $u_m = t_m v_m$, $t_m = \|\nabla u_m\|_p > m$ and $\|\nabla v_m\|_p = 1$. Then the Eberlein-Shmulyan theorem and the Sobolev embedding theorem imply the existence of a subsequence of $\{v_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ (which we denote again $\{v_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$) and $v^* \in W_0^{1,p}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} v_m &\rightharpoonup v^* \text{ weakly in } W_0^{1,p} \text{ and } W_0^{1,q} \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty, \\ v_m &\rightarrow v^* \text{ strongly in } L^p(\Omega) \text{ and } L^q(\Omega) \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by weakly lower semicontinuity of the norms of $W_0^{1,p}$ and $W_0^{1,q}$ we have

$$\|\nabla v^*\|_p \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla v_m\|_p, \quad \|\nabla v^*\|_q \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla v_m\|_q. \quad (4.3)$$

Since $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(u_m) = -G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon(m)}(u_m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$t_m^{p-q} |H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m)| = |G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m)| \leq C_1 < +\infty$$

for some constant C_1 uniformly w.r.t. $m \in \mathbb{N}$, because $G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ is bounded on bounded sets and $\varepsilon(m) \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, taking into account that $t_m \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Using this fact, (4.3), and recalling that $G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) < 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we deduce

$$H_{\lambda_1(p)}(v^*) \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

$$G_{\lambda_1(q)}(v^*) \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) \leq 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Noting that $v_m \rightarrow v^*$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ and $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) = 1 - (\lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon(m)) \|v_m\|_p^p$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(p) \int_{\Omega} |v^*|^p dx &= \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon(m)) \int_{\Omega} |v_m|^p dx \\ &= 1 - \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

which implies that $v^* \neq 0$. At the same time, in view of (4.4) and (4.5), the Poincaré inequality yields

$$H_{\lambda_1(p)}(v^*) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad G_{\lambda_1(q)}(v^*) = 0,$$

and therefore from the simplicity of the first eigenvalues $\lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda_1(q)$ we must have $|v^*| = \varphi_p / \|\nabla \varphi_p\|$ and $|v^*| = \varphi_q / \|\nabla \varphi_q\|$ simultaneously. However, it contradicts **(LI)**. $\blacksquare$

From Lemma 4.4 it follows that there exist non-trivial weak limits $u_0^\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,p}$ of the corresponding minimization subsequences $\{u_k^\varepsilon\}_{k=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$.

Lemma 4.5 *Assume that **(LI)** is satisfied. Then there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that*

$$G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_0^\varepsilon) < 0 < H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon}(u_0^\varepsilon) \quad (4.7)$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ be given by Lemma 4.4 and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$. Note that from (4.2) and weakly lower semicontinuity of the norm of $W_0^{1,q}$ it follows that $G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_0^\varepsilon) < 0$. Therefore, we need to show only that $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon}(u_0^\varepsilon) > 0$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$.

To obtain a contradiction, suppose that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\varepsilon(m) < 1/m$ such that $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(u_0^{\varepsilon(m)}) \leq 0$. We consider the normalized sequence $\{v_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$, where $v_m = u_0^{\varepsilon(m)} / t_m$, $t_m = \|\nabla u_0^{\varepsilon(m)}\|_p$ and $\|\nabla v_m\|_p = 1$. Therefore, by passing to a subsequence, there exists $v^* \in W_0^{1,p}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} v_m &\rightharpoonup v^* \quad \text{weakly in } W_0^{1,p} \quad \text{and } W_0^{1,q} \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty, \\ v_m &\rightarrow v^* \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(\Omega) \quad \text{and } L^q(\Omega) \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Using the assumption $H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(u_0^{\varepsilon(m)}) \leq 0$ and weakly lower semicontinuity we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\lambda_1(p)}(v^*) &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) \leq 0, \\ G_{\lambda_1(q)}(v^*) &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon(m)}(v_m) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the Poincaré inequality as in the proof of Lemma 4.4, we get a contradiction. $\blacksquare$

Now we are able to prove the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.6 *Assume that **(LI)** is satisfied. Then $u_0^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ and*

$$M_\varepsilon := \inf \{ E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u) : u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon} \}$$

is attained on u_0^ε for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$, where $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ is given by Lemma 4.5.

Proof. Fix any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$. Then there exists a weak limit $u_0^\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,p}$ of the minimizing sequence $\{u_k^\varepsilon\}_{k=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ and (4.7) is satisfied.

Let us show that $u_k^\varepsilon \rightarrow u_0^\varepsilon$ strongly in $W_0^{1,p}$ and $u_0^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$. Indeed, contrary to our claim, we suppose that

$$\|\nabla u_0^\varepsilon\|_p < \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u_k^\varepsilon\|_p.$$

Then

$$H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon}(u_0^\varepsilon) + G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_0^\varepsilon) < \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (H_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon) + G_{\lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon)) = 0,$$

which implies that $u_0^\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$. However, according to (4.7), the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 are satisfied. Therefore, there exists a unique minimum point $t(u_0^\varepsilon) \neq 1$ of $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(tu_0^\varepsilon)$ w.r.t. $t > 0$, such that $t(u_0^\varepsilon)u_0^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} M_\varepsilon &\leq E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(t(u_0^\varepsilon)u_0^\varepsilon) < E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_0^\varepsilon) \\ &< \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}(u_k^\varepsilon) = M_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, $u_0^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ and $u_k^\varepsilon \rightarrow u_0^\varepsilon$ strongly in $W_0^{1,p}$. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 4.7 *Assume that (LI) is satisfied. Then $(GEV; \lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon, \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon)$ possesses a positive solution for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 4.5 and Proposition 4.6, $u_0^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ satisfies (4.7) and it is a minimizer of $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$. Since the functional $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ is even, we may assume that $u_0^\varepsilon \geq 0$. Hence, due to Lemma 4.3 and noting (4.7), u_0^ε is a non-trivial and non-negative critical point of $E_{\lambda_1(p)+\varepsilon, \lambda_1(q)+\varepsilon}$ on $W_0^{1,p}$. This ensures that u_0^ε is a positive solution of $(GEV; \lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon, \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon)$ (see Remark 3.1). $\blacksquare$

5. Super- and sub-solutions

In this section, we introduce the super- and sub-solution method for the problem $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. First we recall the definition of super- and sub-solutions.

Definition 5.1 *A function $u \in W_0^{1,p}$ is called a sub-solution (resp. super-solution) of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ if $u \leq 0$ (resp. ≥ 0) on $\partial\Omega$ and*

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} + |\nabla u|^{q-2}) \nabla u \nabla \varphi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} (\alpha |u|^{p-2} u + \beta |u|^{q-2} u) \varphi \, dx \leq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } \geq 0)$$

for any $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}$ satisfying $\varphi(x) \geq 0$ a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

In this section, to simplify the notation, we set

$$f_{\alpha, \beta}(u) := \alpha |u|^{p-2} u + \beta |u|^{q-2} u$$

Taking any $w, v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $w \leq v$ a.e. in Ω , we introduce a truncation

$$f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}(x,t) := \begin{cases} f_{\alpha,\beta}(w(x)) & \text{if } t \geq w(x), \\ f_{\alpha,\beta}(t) & \text{if } v(x) < t < w(x), \\ f_{\alpha,\beta}(v(x)) & \text{if } t \leq v(x), \end{cases}$$

and define the C^1 -functional

$$E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}(u) := \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q dx - \int_{\Omega} \int_0^{u(x)} f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}(x,t) dt dx. \quad (5.1)$$

It is easily seen that $f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}(x,t) = f_{\alpha,\beta}(u(x))$ provided $v(x) \leq t \leq w(x)$.

Remark 5.2 Let $v, w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ be a sub-solution and a super-solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$, respectively, and they satisfy $v \leq w$ in Ω . It follows from the boundedness of $f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}$ that $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}$ is coercive and bounded from below on $W_0^{1,p}$ (cf. [20]). Moreover, it is easy to see that $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}$ is weakly lower semi-continuous. Hence, by the standard arguments (cf. [18, Theorem 1.1]), $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}$ has a global minimum point $u \in W_0^{1,p}$, which becomes a solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. Moreover, $u \in [v, w]$. Indeed, since w is a super-solution, taking $(u - w)_+$ as a test function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \langle (E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]})'(u), (u - w)_+ \rangle - \langle -\Delta_p w - \Delta_q w, (u - w)_+ \rangle \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} (\alpha |w|^{p-2} w + \beta |w|^{q-2} w) (u - w)_+ dx \\ &= \int_{u > w} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w) (\nabla u - \nabla w) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{u > w} (|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u - |\nabla w|^{q-2} \nabla w) (\nabla u - \nabla w) dx \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we take into account that $f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}(x,t) = \alpha |w|^{p-2} w + \beta |w|^{q-2} w$ provided $t \geq w(x)$. This implies that $u \leq w$. Similarly, by taking $(u - v)_-$ as test function, we see that $u \geq v$ holds. Therefore, $f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[v,w]}(x, u(x)) = \alpha |u|^{p-2} u + \beta |u|^{q-2} u$, whence u is a solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$.

In particular, if a sub-solution $v \geq 0$ and u is not-trivial, then it is known that $u \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ (see Remark 3.1).

Lemma 5.3 Assume that $\beta > \lambda_1(q)$ and $w \in \text{int } C^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ is a positive super-solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. Then $\min_{W_0^{1,p}} E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]} < 0$ holds, and hence $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has a positive solution belonging to $\text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$.

Proof. Let $\beta > \lambda_1(q)$ and $w \in \text{int } C^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ be a positive super-solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. Recall that $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}$ has a global minimum point as stated in Remark 5.2.

Since $w \in \text{int } C^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$, for sufficiently small $t > 0$ we have $w - t\varphi_q \geq 0$ in Ω . This implies that $f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}(x, t\varphi_q) = \alpha t^{q-1} \varphi_q^{p-1} + \beta t^{p-1} \varphi_q^{q-1}$. Hence, for sufficiently small $t > 0$, we obtain

$$E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}(t\varphi_q) = \frac{t^p}{p} (\|\nabla \varphi_q\|^p - \alpha \|\varphi_q\|_p^p) - \frac{t^q}{q} (\beta - \lambda_1(q)) \|\varphi_q\|_q^q.$$

Recalling that $q < p$ and $\beta - \lambda_1(q) > 0$, we see that $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}(t\varphi_q) < 0$ for sufficiently small $t > 0$, whence $\min_{W_0^{1,p}} E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]} < 0$. Therefore, $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}$ has a non-trivial critical point, and our conclusion follows (see Remark 5.2). $\blacksquare$

6. Properties of $\lambda^*(s)$

In this section we prove Proposition 2.3.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Part (i). Fix any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $u \in W_0^{1,p}$ be a positive solution of $(GEV; \lambda + s, \lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $u \in \text{int} C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ by Remark 3.1. Choose any $\varphi \in \text{int} C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$. Then, $\varphi/u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and hence we can take

$$\xi = \frac{\varphi^p}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} \in W_0^{1,p}$$

as a test function. Therefore, from Proposition A.2 there follows the existence of $\rho > 0$ independent of u and λ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi^p}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} \right) dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi^p}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} \right) dx \\ &= \lambda \int_{\Omega} \varphi^p dx + s \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1} \varphi^p}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} dx \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^p dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\varphi^{p/q})|^q dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequality with the estimation

$$s \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1} \varphi^p}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} dx \geq \min \left\{ 0, s \int_{\Omega} \varphi^p dx \right\}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R},$$

we conclude that

$$\lambda \int_{\Omega} \varphi^p dx + \min \left\{ 0, s \int_{\Omega} \varphi^p dx \right\} \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^p dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\varphi^{p/q})|^q dx \right). \quad (6.1)$$

Since $\int_{\Omega} \varphi^p dx$, $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^p dx$, $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\varphi^{p/q})|^q dx$ and ρ are positive constants independent of u and λ , λ satisfying (6.1) is bounded from above. Therefore, $\lambda^*(s) < +\infty$, which completes the proof of Part (i).

Part (iv). Assume first that **(LI)** holds. Then Lemma 4.7 implies that $(GEV; \lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon, \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon)$ possesses a positive solution for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Noting that $(\lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon, \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon) = (\lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon + s^*, \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon)$, by definition of $\lambda^*(s^*)$ we have $\lambda^*(s^*) \geq \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon$, and so $\lambda^*(s^*) + s^* \geq \lambda_1(q) + \varepsilon + s^* = \lambda_1(p) + \varepsilon$, which is the desired conclusion.

Assume now that **(LI)** is violated, i.e. $\varphi_p \equiv k\varphi_q$ in Ω for some $k \neq 0$. Let u be a positive weak solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, due to the regularity of φ_p and u (see Remark 3.1), the classical Picone identity [1] implies

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_p^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_p|^p dx = \lambda_1(p) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p dx. \quad (6.2)$$

At the same time, generalized Picone's identity from [12, Lemma 1, p. 536] yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_p^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_p|^{q-2} \nabla \varphi_p \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_p^{p-q+1}}{u^{p-q}} \right) dx \\ &= \lambda_1(q) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p u^{q-p} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

where the last equality is valid because φ_p is an eigenfunction of $-\Delta_q$, by assumption.

Hence, using (6.2) and (6.3), we obtain for the solution u of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_p^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_p^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx \\ = \alpha \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p dx + \beta \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p u^{q-p} dx \leq \lambda_1(p) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p dx + \lambda_1(q) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p u^{q-p} dx, \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible if $\alpha > \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta > \lambda_1(q)$ simultaneously, and the proof is complete.

Part (ii). Assume that $s \neq s^*$. Then taking $\alpha = \lambda + s$ and $\beta = \lambda$, Proposition 2.2 implies that $\lambda^*(s) + s \geq \lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda^*(s) \geq \lambda_1(q)$. If now $s = s^*$ and $\lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda_1(q)$ have the same eigenspace, i.e. there exists $k \neq 0$ such that $\varphi_p \equiv k\varphi_q$ in Ω , then from Proposition 2.1 it follows that $(GEV; \lambda_1(p), \lambda_1(q))$ possesses a positive solution, i.e. $\lambda^*(s^*) + s^* \geq \lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda^*(s^*) \geq \lambda_1(q)$. Finally, if $\lambda_1(p)$ and $\lambda_1(q)$ have different eigenspaces, that is, **(LI)** is satisfied, then Part (iv) of Proposition 2.3 yields the desired result.

Part (vi). Let $s < s'$. Part (ii) of Proposition 2.3 implies that $\lambda^*(s), \lambda^*(s') \geq \lambda_1(q)$. Thus, in order to prove $\lambda^*(s) \geq \lambda^*(s')$, it is sufficient to consider only the case $\lambda^*(s') > \lambda_1(q)$.

Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\lambda^*(s') - \varepsilon > \lambda_1(q)$. Then, by the definition of $\lambda^*(s')$, there exists μ satisfying $\lambda^*(s') > \mu > \lambda^*(s') - \varepsilon$ such that $(GEV; \mu + s', \mu)$ has a positive solution $w_\mu \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$. It is easy to see that w_μ is a positive super-solution of $(GEV; \mu + s, \mu)$, since $s < s'$. Hence, Lemma 5.3 ensures the existence of a positive solution of $(GEV; \mu + s, \mu)$ (note $\mu > \lambda^*(s') - \varepsilon > \lambda_1(q)$). Hence, $\lambda^*(s) \geq \mu (> \lambda^*(s') - \varepsilon)$. Since ε is arbitrary, we have $\lambda^*(s) \geq \lambda^*(s')$.

Next, we show that $\lambda^*(s) + s \leq \lambda^*(s') + s'$ for $s < s'$. If $\lambda^*(s) + s - s' \leq \lambda_1(q)$, then $\lambda^*(s) + s \leq \lambda_1(q) + s' \leq \lambda^*(s') + s'$, due to the fact that $\lambda_1(q) \leq \lambda^*(s')$. So, we may suppose that $\lambda^*(s) + s - s' > \lambda_1(q)$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\lambda^*(s) + s - s' - \varepsilon > \lambda_1(q)$. By the definition of $\lambda^*(s)$, there exists $\mu > \lambda^*(s) - \varepsilon$ such that $(GEV; \mu + s, \mu)$ has a positive solution w_μ . Putting $\beta = \mu + s - s'$, w_μ is the positive solution of $(GEV; \beta + s', \beta + s' - s)$. Noting that $\beta + s' - s > \beta$, w_μ is a positive super-solution of $(GEV; \beta + s', \beta)$. Since $\beta > \lambda^*(s) + s - s' - \varepsilon > \lambda_1(q)$, by the same argument above, we get $\lambda^*(s') \geq \lambda^*(s) + s - s'$, whence $\lambda^*(s) + s \leq \lambda^*(s') + s'$.

Part (iii). Assume first that **(LI)** doesn't hold. Then $s^* = s_+^*$ and, due to Part (iv) of Proposition 2.3, $\lambda^*(s^*) \leq \lambda_1(q)$. At the same time, $\lambda^*(s) \geq \lambda_1(q)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ by Part (ii). Hence, $\lambda^*(s^*) = \lambda_1(q)$ and noting that $\lambda^*(s)$ is non-increasing by Part (vi) we get the desired result.

Let now **(LI)** hold and suppose, by contradiction, that there exists $s \geq s_+^*$ such that $\lambda^*(s) > \lambda_1(q)$. Since $\lambda^*(s^*) + s^* > \lambda_1(p)$ by Part (iv) of Proposition 2.3, using Part (vi) and recalling that s , we get

$$\lambda^*(s) + s \geq \lambda^*(s^*) + s^* > \lambda_1(p).$$

By definition of $\lambda^*(s)$, for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0)$ such that $(GEV; \lambda^*(s) + s - \varepsilon, \lambda^*(s) - \varepsilon)$ possesses a positive solution. Let us take ε_0 small enough to satisfy

$$\lambda^*(s) + s - \varepsilon_0 > \lambda_1(p), \quad \lambda^*(s) - \varepsilon_0 > \lambda_1(q), \quad (6.4)$$

and let u be a corresponding solution of $(GEV; \lambda^*(s) + s - \varepsilon, \lambda^*(s) - \varepsilon)$, where $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0)$.

Using the Picone identities (6.2) and (6.3) applied to φ_q instead of φ_p , we obtain the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_q^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_q^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx \\ &= (\lambda^*(s) + s - \varepsilon) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p dx + (\lambda^*(s) - \varepsilon) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p u^{q-p} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_q|^p dx + \lambda_1(q) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p u^{q-p} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

On the other hand, since $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, from (6.4) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda_1(q) + s) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p dx + \lambda_1(q) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p u^{q-p} dx \\ &< (\lambda^*(s) + s - \varepsilon) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p dx + (\lambda^*(s) - \varepsilon) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p u^{q-p} dx \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

Finally, combining (6.5) with (6.6) we conclude that

$$s < \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_q|^p dx}{\int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p dx} - \lambda_1(q) = s_+^*,$$

which contradicts our assumption $s \geq s_+^*$.

Part (v). Since $\lambda^*(s)$ is bounded for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ by Part (i) of Proposition 2.3 and non-increasing by Part (vi), for every $s' \in \mathbb{R}$ there exist one-sided limits of $\lambda^*(s)$ and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow s'-0} \lambda^*(s) \geq \lambda^*(s') \geq \lim_{s \rightarrow s'+0} \lambda^*(s). \quad (6.7)$$

On the other hand, $\lambda^*(s) + s$ is non-decreasing by Part (vi) of Proposition 2.3, and hence

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow s'-0} (\lambda^*(s) + s) \leq \lambda^*(s') + s' \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow s'+0} (\lambda^*(s) + s),$$

which yields

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow s'-0} \lambda^*(s) \leq \lambda^*(s') \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow s'+0} \lambda^*(s). \quad (6.8)$$

Combining (6.7) with (6.8) we conclude that the one-sided limits are equal to $\lambda^*(s')$, which establishes the desired continuity, due to the arbitrary choice of $s' \in \mathbb{R}$. ■

7. Proof of Theorems 2.4, 2.5 and Proposition 2.6

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Note first that from Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 it directly follows that if (2.2) is satisfied, then $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has at least one positive solution.

Conversely, if $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has at least one positive solution, then by the definition of $\lambda^*(s)$, Part (iv) of Proposition 2.3, and Proposition 2.1, it has to satisfy

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in (\lambda_1(p), +\infty) \times (-\infty, \lambda_1(q)] \cup (-\infty, \lambda_1(p)] \times (\lambda_1(q), +\infty) \cup \{(\lambda_1(p), \lambda_1(q))\}.$$

To prove (2.2), it is sufficient to show that $(\alpha, \beta) \notin \{\lambda_1(p)\} \times (\lambda_1(q), +\infty)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \notin (\lambda_1(p), +\infty) \times \{\lambda_1(q)\}$. Suppose that $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has a positive solution u for $\alpha = \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta \geq \lambda_1(q)$ (resp. $\alpha \geq \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta = \lambda_1(q)$). Then, as in the proof of Proposition 2.3, Part (iv), from (6.2) and (6.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_p^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_p^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx \\ &= \alpha \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p dx + \beta \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p u^{q-p} dx \leq \lambda_1(p) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p dx + \lambda_1(q) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_p^p u^{q-p} dx, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\beta = \lambda_1(q)$ (resp. $\alpha = \lambda_1(p)$). Hence, we get the desired result. $\blacksquare$

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Consider first the non-existence result. Let $\beta > \lambda^*(\alpha - \beta)$. Then the definition of $\lambda^*(\alpha - \beta)$ implies that $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has no positive solutions.

(i) Assume that $\lambda_1(q) < \beta < \lambda^*(s)$ with $s = \alpha - \beta$. Then, by the definition of $\lambda^*(s)$, there exists $\mu \in (\beta, \lambda^*(s)]$ such that $(GEV; \mu + s, \mu)$ has a positive solution $w \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ (see Remark 3.1). Moreover, w is a positive super-solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta) \equiv (GEV; \beta + s, \beta)$, since $\mu > \beta$. Hence, the assumptions of Lemma 5.3 are satisfied, which guarantees the existence of a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$.

(ii) Assume now that $\lambda_1(p) < \alpha$ and $\beta < \lambda^*(s)$ with $s = \alpha - \beta$. Note that if $\beta > \lambda_1(q)$, then Part (i) gives the claim. If $\beta < \lambda_1(q)$, then Proposition 2.2 implies the desired result. Therefore, it remains to consider the case $\beta = \lambda_1(q)$.

Let us divide the proof into three cases:

Case 1. φ_q satisfies $\|\nabla \varphi_q\|_p^p - \alpha \|\varphi_q\|_p^p > 0$. Note that

$$\lambda_1 \left(q, \frac{\lambda_1(q)}{\alpha} \right) = \frac{\lambda_1(q)\alpha}{\lambda_1(q)} = \alpha > \lambda_1(p) = \lambda_1(p, 1).$$

This yields (1.2) with $r = q$, $r' = p$, $\lambda = \alpha$, $m_p \equiv 1$ and $m_q \equiv \frac{\lambda_1(q)}{\alpha}$. Moreover, since $\lambda_1(r, c)$ and $\lambda_1(r, 1) = \lambda_1(r)$ have the same eigenspace for any constant $c > 0$, namely, $\varphi_1(r, c) = t\varphi_1(r, 1) = t\varphi_r$ for some $t > 0$, the hypothesis of Case 1 ensures (1.3). Hence, Theorem 1.3 guarantees our conclusion.

Case 2. φ_q satisfies $\|\nabla \varphi_q\|_p^p - \alpha \|\varphi_q\|_p^p < 0$. Since $\beta < \lambda^*(s)$, by definition of $\lambda^*(s)$ there exists $\mu \in (\beta, \lambda^*(s)]$ such that $(GEV; \mu + s, \mu)$ possesses a positive solution $w \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$. As in the proof of Part (i) it is easy to see that w is a positive super-solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta) \equiv (GEV; \beta + s, \beta)$.

Let $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}$ be the functional defined by (5.1) with a positive super-solution w and sub-solution 0. Since w and φ_q belong to $\text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$, for sufficiently small $t > 0$ we get $t\varphi_q \leq w$ in Ω , whence $f_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}(x, t\varphi_q) = \alpha t^{p-1}\varphi_q^{p-1} + \beta t^{q-1}\varphi_q^{q-1}$. Therefore, noting that $\beta = \lambda_1(q)$, for such small $t > 0$ we have

$$E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}(t\varphi_q) = \frac{t^p}{p} (\|\nabla\varphi_q\|_p^p - \alpha\|\varphi_q\|_p^p) < 0.$$

This ensures that $\inf_{W_0^{1,p}} E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]} < 0$. Hence, $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has a positive solution (refer to Remark 5.2).

Case 3. φ_q satisfies $\|\nabla\varphi_q\|_p^p - \alpha\|\varphi_q\|_p^p = 0$. Similarly to Case 2, we know that $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}(t\varphi_q) = 0$ for sufficiently small $t > 0$. If $\min_{W_0^{1,p}} E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]} < 0$ holds, then $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$ has a positive solution. On the other hand, if $\min_{W_0^{1,p}} E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]} = 0$, then $t\varphi_q$ is a global minimizer of $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{[0,w]}$, whence $t\varphi_q$ is a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. Consequently, the proof is complete. $\blacksquare$

For the proof of Proposition 2.6, we prepare two lemmas. The following lemma is needed to prove the boundedness of approximate solutions.

Lemma 7.1 *Let u_n be a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha_n, \beta_n)$ with $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta$. If $\|\nabla u_n\|_p \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\alpha = \lambda_1(p)$.*

Proof. Let u_n be a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha_n, \beta_n)$ with $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha$, $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta$ and $\|\nabla u_n\|_p \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Setting $w_n := u_n / \|\nabla u_n\|_p$, we may admit, up to subsequence, that $w_n \rightarrow w_0$ weakly in $W_0^{1,p}$ and strongly in $L^p(\Omega)$ and $L^q(\Omega)$ for some $w_0 \in W_0^{1,p}$. By taking $(w_n - w_0) / \|\nabla u_n\|_p^{p-1}$ as a test function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^{p-2} \nabla w_n \nabla (w_n - w_0) dx + \frac{1}{\|\nabla u_n\|_p^{p-q}} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^{q-2} \nabla w_n \nabla (w_n - w_0) dx \\ &\quad - \alpha_n \int_{\Omega} w_n^{p-1} (w_n - w_0) dx - \frac{\beta_n}{\|\nabla u_n\|_p^{p-q}} \int_{\Omega} w_n^{q-1} (w_n - w_0) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^{p-2} \nabla w_n \nabla (w_n - w_0) dx + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Due to the (S_+) property of $-\Delta_p$ (cf. [9, Definition 5.8.31 and Lemma 5.9.14]), this implies that $w_n \rightarrow w_0$ strongly in $W_0^{1,p}$. Then, for any $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}$, by taking $\varphi / \|\nabla u_n\|_p^{p-1}$ as test function we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^{p-2} \nabla w_n \nabla \varphi dx + \frac{1}{\|\nabla u_n\|_p^{p-q}} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^{q-2} \nabla w_n \nabla \varphi dx \\ &\quad - \alpha_n \int_{\Omega} w_n^{p-1} \varphi dx - \frac{\beta_n}{\|\nabla u_n\|_p^{p-q}} \int_{\Omega} w_n^{q-1} \varphi dx. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude that w_0 is a non-negative, non-trivial solution of $(EV; p, \alpha)$ (note $w_0 \geq 0$ and $\|\nabla w_0\|_p = 1$). According to the strong maximum principle (see Remark 3.1), we have $w_0 > 0$ in Ω . This yields that w_0 is a positive eigenfunction corresponding to α and $\alpha = \lambda_1(p)$, since any eigenvalue other than $\lambda_1(p)$ has no positive eigenfunctions. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 7.2 *If u is a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$, then*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^q |\nabla u|^{p-q} dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^q dx \geq \int_{\Omega} (\alpha u^{p-q} + \beta) \varphi^q dx$$

for every $\varphi \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$.

Proof. Let u be a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$. Then, $u \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ (see Remark 3.1). Choose any $\varphi \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$. Then, $\varphi/u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and hence we can take

$$\xi = \frac{\varphi^q}{u^{q-1}} \in W_0^{1,p}$$

as a test function. By the similar estimation as in the proof of Proposition A.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi^q}{u^{q-1}} \right) &= q |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \left(\frac{\varphi}{u} \right)^{q-1} - (q-1) |\nabla u|^p \left(\frac{\varphi}{u} \right)^q \\ &\leq q |\nabla u|^{p-1} |\nabla \varphi| \left(\frac{\varphi}{u} \right)^{q-1} - (q-1) |\nabla u|^p \left(\frac{\varphi}{u} \right)^q \leq |\nabla \varphi|^q |\nabla u|^{p-q} \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

in Ω , where we use the standard Young's inequality

$$ab \leq \frac{a^q}{q} + \frac{(q-1)b^{q/(q-1)}}{q}$$

with $a = |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla u|^{p-1-d}$, $b = (\varphi/u)^{q-1} |\nabla u|^d$ and $d = (q-1)p/q = p - p/q$.

At the same time, the standard Picone identity [1] implies

$$|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi^q}{u^{q-1}} \right) \leq |\nabla \varphi|^q \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (7.2)$$

Applying now estimations (7.1) and (7.2) to the definition of a weak solution, we obtain the desired result. $\blacksquare$

Proof of Proposition 2.6. Part (i). Put $\alpha = \lambda^*(s) + s > \lambda_1(p)$ and $\beta = \lambda^*(s) > \lambda_1(q)$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$. By the definition of $\lambda^*(s)$, there exists $\beta_n > \lambda_1(q)$ such that $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta = \lambda^*(s)$ and $(GEV; \alpha_n, \beta_n)$ has a positive solution u_n , where $\alpha_n = \beta_n + s$. Since $\alpha_n \rightarrow \beta + s = \lambda^*(s) + s > \lambda_1(p)$, Lemma 7.1 guarantees the boundedness of $\{u_n\}$ in $W_0^{1,p}$.

Then, $\{u_n\}$ is a bounded Palais–Smale sequence for the functional $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ defined by (3.1). Indeed, $I'_{\alpha_n,\beta_n}(u_n) = 0$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \|I'_{\alpha,\beta}(u_n)\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^*} &= \|I'_{\alpha,\beta}(u_n) - I'_{\alpha_n,\beta_n}(u_n)\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^*} \\ &\leq \frac{|\alpha_n - \alpha|}{p\lambda_1(p)^{1/p}} \|u_n\|_p^{p-1} + \frac{|\beta_n - \beta|}{q\lambda_1(p)^{1/q}} \|u_n\|_q^{q-1} |\Omega|^{1/q-1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by a standard argument based on the (S_+) property of $-\Delta_p$ (cf., [24, Lemma 8]), it can be readily shown that $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfies the bounded Palais–Smale condition. Hence, $\{u_n\}$ has a subsequence converging to some critical point u_0 of $I_{\alpha,\beta}$. Thus, if we show that $u_0 \neq 0$, then u_0 is a positive solution of $(GEV; \alpha, \beta)$, whence the proof is complete.

Now, we will prove that $u_0 \neq 0$ by way of contradiction. Assume that u_n strongly converges to 0 in $W_0^{1,p}$. Applying Lemma 7.2 with $\varphi = \varphi_q$, we see that any u_n satisfies the inequality

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_q|^q |\nabla u_n|^{p-q} dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_q|^q dx \geq \int_{\Omega} (\alpha_n u_n^{p-q} + \beta_n) \varphi_q^q dx.$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\|\nabla \varphi_q\|_q^q \geq \beta \|\varphi_q\|_q^q$. However, this is a contradiction, since $\lambda_1(q) \|\varphi_q\|_q^q = \|\nabla \varphi_q\|_q^q \geq \beta \|\varphi_q\|_q^q$ and $\beta > \lambda_1(q)$.

Part (ii). From Part (iii) of Proposition 2.3 it follows that $(GEV; \lambda^*(s) + s, \lambda^*(s)) \equiv (GEV; \lambda_1(q) + s, \lambda_1(q))$ for all $s \geq s_+^*$. Suppose, contrary to our claim, that $(GEV; \lambda_1(q) + s, \lambda_1(q))$ possesses a positive solution u for some $s > s_+^*$. As in the proof of Part (iii), Proposition 2.3, we replace φ_p by φ_q in Picone's identities (6.2) and (6.3), and get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_q^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_q^p}{u^{p-1}} \right) dx \\ &= (\lambda_1(q) + s) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p dx + \lambda_1(q) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p u^{q-p} dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_q|^p dx + \lambda_1(q) \int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p u^{q-p} dx, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$s \leq \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_q|^p dx}{\int_{\Omega} \varphi_q^p dx} - \lambda_1(q) = s_+^*.$$

However, it is a contradiction, since $s > s_+^*$. ■

8. Minimax formula for $\lambda^*(s)$

In this section we prove that definitions (2.1) and (2.3) are, in fact, equivalent.

Proof of Proposition 2.7. Fix any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\lambda^*(s)$ is bounded from below by Part (ii) of Proposition 2.3, the definition (2.1) implies the existence of a sequence of solutions $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ (see Remark 3.1) for $(GEV; \lambda_n + s, \lambda_n)$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda^*(s)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and each $\lambda_n \leq \lambda^*(s)$ (note that here we allow $\lambda_n = \lambda^*(s)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$).

Using u_n as an admissible function for (2.3) and noting that for any $0 \neq \varphi \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ the denominator of $\mathcal{L}_s(u_n; \varphi)$ is positive, namely,

$$\int_{\Omega} (u_n^{p-1} + u_n^{q-1}) \varphi dx > 0,$$

we get

$$\Lambda^*(s) \geq \inf_{\varphi \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{L}_s(u_n; \varphi) = \lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda^*(s),$$

and therefore $\Lambda^*(s) \geq \lambda^*(s)$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Assume now that there exists $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Lambda^*(s_0) > \lambda^*(s_0)$. Then, by the definition of $\Lambda^*(s)$, there exist $w \in \text{int } C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ for which we have

$$\Lambda^*(s_0) \geq \mu := \inf_{\varphi \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{L}_{s_0}(w; \varphi) > \lambda^*(s_0).$$

However, this implies that w is a positive super-solution of $(GEV; \mu + s_0, \mu)$.
Indeed

$$\mathcal{L}_{s_0}(w; \varphi) \geq \mu > \lambda^*(s_0) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \setminus \{0\},$$

and therefore

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla w|^{p-2} + |\nabla w|^{q-2}) \nabla w \nabla \varphi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} ((\mu + s_0)|w|^{p-2} + \mu|w|^{q-2}) w \varphi \, dx \geq 0$$

for any $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}$ satisfying $\varphi(x) \geq 0$ a.e. $x \in \Omega$, due to the approximation arguments. Hence, recalling that $\mu > \lambda^*(s_0) \geq \lambda_1(q)$, Lemma 5.3 guarantees the existence of a positive solution for $(GEV; \mu + s_0, \mu)$, however it contradicts the definition of $\lambda^*(s_0)$. $\blacksquare$

A. The Picone identity for the (p, q) -Laplacian

In this section we prove the variant of Picone's-type identity (cf. [1]), which turns to be useful for problems with (p, q) -Laplacian.

First we prepare one auxiliary result. Denote

$$g(p, q; t) := \frac{(p-1)t^{p-2} + (q-1)t^{q-2}}{(p-1)(t^{p-1} + t^{q-1})^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Lemma A.1 *Let $1 < q, p < \infty$. Then $\inf_{t>0} g(p, q; t) > 0$.*

Proof. Let us denote $\tilde{m} := \min\{p-1, q-1\}$. By standard calculations we get

$$\begin{aligned} g(p, q; t) &= \frac{(p-1)t^{p-2} + (q-1)t^{q-2}}{(p-1)(t^{p-1} + t^{q-1})^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}} = \frac{\tilde{m}t^{p-2} \left(\frac{p-1}{\tilde{m}} + \frac{q-1}{\tilde{m}} t^{q-p} \right)}{(p-1)t^{p-2} (1 + t^{q-p})^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}} \\ &\geq \frac{\tilde{m}(1 + t^{q-p})}{(p-1)(1 + t^{q-p})^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}} = \frac{\tilde{m}}{p-1} (1 + t^{q-p})^{\frac{1}{p-1}} > \frac{\tilde{m}}{p-1} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $t > 0$, which completes the proof. $\blacksquare$

Proposition A.2 *Let $1 < q < p < \infty$. Then there exists $\rho > 0$ such that for any differentiable functions $u > 0$ and $\varphi \geq 0$ in Ω it holds*

$$(|\nabla u|^{p-2} + |\nabla u|^{q-2}) \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi^p}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} \right) \leq \frac{|\nabla \varphi|^p + |\nabla (\varphi^{p/q})|^q}{\rho}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Proof. First, by standard calculations we get

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi^p}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} \right) \\ &= p|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \frac{\varphi^{p-1}}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} - |\nabla u|^p \varphi^p \frac{(p-1)u^{p-2} + (q-1)u^{q-2}}{(u^{p-1} + u^{q-1})^2} \\ &\leq p|\nabla u|^{p-1} |\nabla \varphi| \frac{\varphi^{p-1}}{u^{p-1} + u^{q-1}} - |\nabla u|^p \varphi^p \frac{(p-1)u^{p-2} + (q-1)u^{q-2}}{(u^{p-1} + u^{q-1})^2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

in Ω . Applying to the first term Young's inequality

$$ab = \frac{a}{\rho^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} \rho^{\frac{p-1}{p}} b \leq \frac{|a|^p}{p\rho^{p-1}} + \frac{\rho(p-1)|b|^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}{p}$$

with $a = |\nabla\varphi|$, $b = |\nabla u|^{p-1} \frac{\varphi^{p-1}}{u^{p-1}+u^{q-1}}$ and any $\rho > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{A.3}) &\leq \frac{|\nabla\varphi|^p}{\rho^{p-1}} + \frac{\rho(p-1)|\nabla u|^p \varphi^p}{(u^{p-1}+u^{q-1})^{\frac{p}{p-1}}} - |\nabla u|^p \varphi^p \frac{(p-1)u^{p-2} + (q-1)u^{q-2}}{(u^{p-1}+u^{q-1})^2} \\ &= \frac{|\nabla\varphi|^p}{\rho^{p-1}} + \frac{\rho(p-1)|\nabla u|^p \varphi^p}{(u^{p-1}+u^{q-1})^{\frac{p}{p-1}}} \left[1 - \frac{(p-1)u^{p-2} + (q-1)u^{q-2}}{\rho(p-1)(u^{p-1}+u^{q-1})^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}} \right] \\ &= \frac{|\nabla\varphi|^p}{\rho^{p-1}} + \frac{\rho(p-1)|\nabla u|^p \varphi^p}{(u^{p-1}+u^{q-1})^{\frac{p}{p-1}}} \left[1 - \frac{g(p, q; u)}{\rho} \right] \end{aligned}$$

in Ω , where $g(p, q; t)$ is defined by (A.1). Since Lemma A.1 implies that $\inf_{t>0} g(p, q; t)$ is positive, we can choose $\rho_1 > 0$ small enough to satisfy $\inf_{t>0} g(p, q; t) \geq \rho_1$. This yields $[1 - g(p, q; u)/\rho_1] \leq 0$ in Ω , and therefore

$$|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi^p}{u^{p-1}+u^{q-1}} \right) \leq \frac{|\nabla\varphi|^p}{\rho_1^{p-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Similarly, if we choose $\rho_2 > 0$ satisfying $\inf_{t>0} g(q, p; t) \geq \rho_2$, then for $\psi = \varphi^{p/q}$ (note $p/q > 1$ and $\varphi^p = \psi^q$) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(\frac{\psi^q}{u^{p-1}+u^{q-1}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{|\nabla\psi|^q}{\rho_2^{q-1}} + \frac{\rho_2(q-1)|\nabla u|^q \psi^q}{(u^{p-1}+u^{q-1})^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \left[1 - \frac{g(q, p; u)}{\rho_2} \right] \leq \frac{|\nabla\psi|^q}{\rho_2^{q-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Combining now (A.4) with (A.5) and taking $\rho := \min\{\rho_1^{p-1}, \rho_2^{q-1}\}$ we establish the formula (A.2). $\blacksquare$

B. Non-monotonicity of $\lambda_1(p)$ with respect to p

The main aim of this section is to provide sufficient conditions for $\lambda_1(p)$ to be a non-monotone function w.r.t. p .

Throughout this section, we write $\lambda_1(p, \Omega)$ to reflect the dependence of the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(p)$ on the domain Ω , on which it is defined.

By B_R we denote an open ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ of radius R . We don't fix the center of B_R and write $B_R \subset \Omega$ ($\Omega \subset B_R$) if such center exists.

Proposition B.1 *Assume that $r, R \in (1, e)$ and a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 2$) satisfy*

$$\max\{1, e \ln R\} < r \leq R < e \quad \text{and} \quad B_r \subset \Omega \subset B_R.$$

Then, the function $\lambda_1(p, \Omega)$ w.r.t. p has a maximum point $p^* > 1$, and hence it is non-monotone.

In particular, if $\Omega = B_R$ with $R \in (1, e)$, then $\lambda_1(p, \Omega)$ is non-monotone w.r.t. p .

Proof. Note that $\lambda_1(p, \Omega)$ is a continuous function w.r.t. p (see [11, Theorem 2.1]). Hence, to prove that $\lambda_1(p, \Omega)$ possesses a maximum point $p^* > 1$ it is sufficient to show the existence of $p_0 > 1$ such that

$$\lambda_1(p_0, \Omega) > \max \left\{ \lim_{p \rightarrow 1+0} \lambda_1(p, \Omega), \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(p, \Omega) \right\}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

First we find the corresponding limits. On the one hand, [11, Theorem 3.1] and [3, Corollary 5] yield that if there exists $r > 1$ such that $B_r \subset \Omega$, then

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(p, \Omega) = 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

On the other hand, it is proved in [15, Corollary 6] that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1+0} \lambda_1(p, \Omega) = h(\Omega), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $h(\Omega)$ is the so-called *Cheeger constant* defined by

$$h(\Omega) := \inf_{D \subset \Omega} \frac{|\partial D|}{|D|}.$$

Here $|\partial D|$ and $|D|$ are $(N-1)$ - and N -dimensional Lebesgue measure of ∂D and D , respectively. Note that Cheeger's constant is known explicitly for some domains; for instance, B_r has $h(B_r) = \frac{N}{r}$ (see [15]).

Now to get (B.1) we use the following estimation from [3, Theorem 2], which holds for any $\Omega \subset B_R$:

$$\lambda_1(p, \Omega) \geq \frac{Np}{Rp}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Simple analysis of the function $y(p) = \frac{Np}{Rp}$ shows that if $R \in (1, e)$ then there exists a unique maximum point $p_0 = \frac{1}{\ln R} > 1$ of $y(p)$, and $y(p_0) = \frac{N}{e \ln R}$.

Let us show now the existence of $r, R \in (1, e)$ such that for any Ω with $B_r \subset \Omega \subset B_R$ it holds $y(p_0) > h(\Omega)$. Then (B.2), (B.3) and (B.4) will imply (B.1), which proves the assertion of the proposition.

From the monotonicity of Cheeger's constant with respect to a domain (see [15, Remark 11]) it follows that $h(B_r) \geq h(\Omega)$, whenever $B_r \subset \Omega$. Therefore, it is enough to show that

$$y(p_0) = \frac{N}{e \ln R} > \frac{N}{r} = h(B_r) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

holds for some $r, R \in (1, e)$ with $r < R$. Inequality (B.5) is read as $r > e \ln R$. It is not hard to see that for any fixed $R \in (1, e)$ we have $\max\{1, e \ln R\} < R$, since the function $\ln t/t$ ($t > 0$) has the maximum value $1/e$ only at $t = e$.

Thus, for any $r, R \in (1, e)$ and $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$\max\{1, e \ln R\} < r \leq R < e \quad \text{and} \quad B_r \subset \Omega \subset B_R,$$

the inequality (B.1) is satisfied for some $p_0 > 1$, and this completes the proof. ▀

C. Violation of the assumption (LI)

In this section we give a short one-dimensional example indicating that, in general, the first eigenvalues $\lambda_1(p, m_p)$ and $\lambda_1(q, m_q)$ of zero Dirichlet $-\Delta_p$ and $-\Delta_q$ on Ω with weights m_p and m_q , respectively, can have the same eigenspace, that is, $\varphi_1(p, m_p) \equiv k\varphi_1(q, m_q)$ in Ω for some $k \neq 0$.

Let u be a positive C^2 -solution of

$$\begin{cases} -u'' = |u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } (0, \pi), \\ u(0) = u(\pi) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $p > 2$. Existence and regularity of such a solution is a classical example in various textbooks on nonlinear analysis (see, e.g., [9, Example 7.4.7, p. 485]).

It is easy to see, that u is also the first eigenfunction of zero Dirichlet $-\Delta$ on $(0, \pi)$ with the weight function $m_2(x) = |u(x)|^{p-2}$, with the corresponding eigenvalue $\lambda_1(2, m_2) = 1$. Note that $m_2 > 0$ in $(0, \pi)$ and $m_2 \in L^\infty[0, \pi]$, since $p > 2$.

At the same time, u becomes the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on $(0, \pi)$ with weight $m_p(x) = (p-1)|u'(x)|^{p-2}$, with the eigenvalue $\lambda_1(p, m_p) = 1$. Indeed,

$$\begin{cases} -(|u'|^{p-2}u')' \equiv -(p-1)|u'|^{p-2}u'' \\ \quad = (p-1)|u'|^{p-2}|u|^{p-2}u = m_p(x)|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } (0, \pi), \\ u(0) = u(\pi) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $m_p \in L^\infty[0, \pi]$, since $p > 2$ and $u \in C^2[0, \pi]$, and $m_p \geq 0$ in $[0, \pi]$.

Therefore, $\lambda_1(2, m_2)$ and $\lambda_1(p, m_p)$ have the same eigenspace, i.e. (LI) is violated.

References

- [1] ALLEGRETTO, W., AND HUANG, Y.-X. A picone's identity for the p -laplacian and applications. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications* 32, 7 (1998), 819–830.
- [2] ANANE, A. Simplicité et isolation de la première valeur propre du p -laplacien avec poids. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences. Série 1, Mathématique* 305, 16 (1987), 725–728.
- [3] BENEDIKT, J., AND DRÁBEK, P. Estimates of the principal eigenvalue of the p -laplacian. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 393, 1 (2012), 311–315.
- [4] BENOUBHA, N., AND BELYACINE, Z. A class of eigenvalue problems for the (p, q) -laplacian in R^n . *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.* 50 (2012), 727–737.
- [5] BENOUBHA, N., AND BELYACINE, Z. On the solutions of the (p, q) -laplacian problem at resonance. *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* 77 (2013), 74–81.
- [6] BOBKOV, V., AND IL'YASOV, Y. Maximal existence domains of positive solutions for two-parametric systems of elliptic equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5275* (2014).

- [7] CHERFILS, L., AND IL'YASOV, Y. On the stationary solutions of generalized reaction diffusion equations with p & q -laplacian. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 4, 1 (2005), 9–22.
- [8] CUESTA, M., DE FIGUEIREDO, D., AND GOSSEZ, J.-P. The beginning of the Fučík spectrum for the p -laplacian. *Journal of Differential Equations* 159, 1 (1999), 212–238.
- [9] DRÁBEK, P., AND MILOTA, J. *Methods of nonlinear analysis: applications to differential equations*. Springer, 2013.
- [10] GONGBAO, L., AND GUO, Z. Multiple solutions for the p & q -laplacian problem with critical exponent. *Acta Mathematica Scientia* 29, 4 (2009), 903–918.
- [11] HUANG, Y. On the eigenvalues of the p -laplacian with varying p . *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 125, 11 (1997), 3347–3354.
- [12] IL'YASOV, Y. On positive solutions of indefinite elliptic equations. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics* 333, 6 (2001), 533–538.
- [13] ILYASOV, Y. S. Bifurcation calculus by the extended functional method. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications* 41, 1 (2007), 18–30.
- [14] KAJIKIYA, R., TANAKA, M., AND TANAKA, S. Bifurcation of positive solutions for the one dimensional (p, q) -laplace equation. *submitted*.
- [15] KAWOHL, B., AND FRIDMAN, V. Isoperimetric estimates for the first eigenvalue of the p -laplace operator and the Cheeger constant. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin* 44, 4 (2003), 659–667.
- [16] LIEBERMAN, G. M. Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications* 12, 11 (1988), 1203–1219.
- [17] LIEBERMAN, G. M. The natural generalizationj of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural'tseva for elliptic equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 16, 2-3 (1991), 311–361.
- [18] MAWHIN, J., AND WILLEM, M. *Critical point theory and Hamiltonian systems*. Springer, 1989.
- [19] MIHAILESCU, M. An eigenvalue problem possessing a continuous family of eigenvalues plus an isolated eigenvalue. *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis* 10 (2011), 701–708.
- [20] MIYAJIMA, S., MOTREANU, D., AND TANAKA, M. Multiple existence results of solutions for the Neumann problems via super-and sub-solutions. *Journal of Functional Analysis* 262, 4 (2012), 1921–1953.
- [21] MOTREANU, D., AND TANAKA, M. On a positive solution for (p, q) -laplace equation with indefinite weight. *To appear in Minimax Theory and its Applications*.

- [22] PUCCI, P., AND SERRIN, J. *The maximum principle*, vol. 73. Springer, 2007.
- [23] RAMOS QUOIRIN, H. An indefinite type equation involving two p -laplacians. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 387, 1 (2012), 189–200.
- [24] TANAKA, M. Generalized eigenvalue problems for (p, q) -laplacian with indefinite weight. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 419, 2 (2014), 1181 – 1192.
- [25] TANAKA, M. Uniqueness of a positive solution and existence of a sign-changing solution for (p, q) -laplace equation. *J. Nonlinear Funct. Anal.* 2014 (2014), 1–15.
- [26] YIN, H., AND YANG, Z. Multiplicity of positive solutions to a $p - q$ -laplacian equation involving critical nonlinearity. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications* 75, 6 (2012), 3021 – 3035.
- [27] ZEIDLER, E. *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Application III.: Variational Methods and Optimization*. Springer-Verlag GmbH, 1985.